



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,797	01/15/2004	Lev Borisovich Nachmanson	3382-66933	6509
26119 7590 07/03/2008 KLARQUIST SPARKMAN LLP 121 S.W. SALMON STREET SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER				
SILVER, DAVID				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2128				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/758,797

Applicant(s)

NACHMANSON ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID SILVER

Art Unit

2128

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-15,18 and 20-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-15,18 and 20-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-15, 18, and 20-26 are currently pending in Instant Application.
2. The Instant Application is not currently in condition for allowance.

Response to Arguments

Response: 35 U.S.C. § 101 / 112

3. Applicants' amendments are sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection.
4. Applicants' amendments to "make the claims even more fully comply with the enablement requirement" (Remarks: page 11) have been considered and are persuasive.
5. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections have been withdrawn.

Response: 35 U.S.C. § 102 / 103

6. Applicants' arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections have been fully considered but are persuasive. However, new grounds of rejections are presented below as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Interpretation

7. Limitations drawn to allowing, enabling or making optional a function's performance does not further limit a claim. As such, any prior art not explicitly prohibiting the performance of the function inherently anticipates the limitation. See MPEP 2111.04.
8. Patentable weight is not given to the programs enumerated in claim 7 as 1) they are "operationally able", but do not necessarily perform function (see MPEP 2111.04), and 2) because they are drawn to non-descriptive matter per se.

Claim Objections

9. Claim 1 is objected to for the term "the cost" lacking antecedent basis. The term should start with "a", not "the".
10. Claim 22 is not being examined because it depends on itself (improper dependent claim).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office

Art Unit: 2128

action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 3, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (**US 5,659,555**), and further in view of Sun (**US 5630051**), in further view of Kadkade (**US 7290193**).

Lee discloses: 1. A computerized method of creating test coverage for non-deterministic programs within a testing environment comprising:

In a computer, receiving a graph of edges and states representing a program under test, the states comprising at least one deterministic state controllable by the testing environment and at least one non-deterministic state uncontrollable by the testing environment (**col: 5 line: 12-17; col: 6 line: 8-25; col: 7 line: 30-42**);

creating a continuous cycle of edges through the graph that reaches each state in the graph at least once (**col: 12 line: 4-14**);

executing the program under test as a first execution of the program (**col: 8 line: 37-51**);
determining untested states not reached by the first execution of the program (**col: 4 line: 10-25; col: 8 line: 3-10; Fig 5 and descriptions; col: 11 line: 24-34**);

calculating, for at least some deterministic states, a probability that during program execution, a path from the deterministic state will reach the at least one untested state; calculating, for the at least some deterministic state, a number of edges between the at least one deterministic state and the untested state as the cost

creating strategies through the graph that have a higher probability of reaching discrete sequences not reached by the program (**col: 4 line: 11-23; col: 8 line: 37-51**);

storing a representation of the created strategies in computer memory; and

executing the program under test under test conditions using the stored created strategies that cause the program to have a higher probability to execute through states that correspond to the untested program behavior (**col: 4 line: 11-23; col: 8 line: 37-51**).

Art Unit: 2128

Lee however does not expressly disclose calculating, for at least some deterministic states, a probability that during program execution, a path from the deterministic state will reach the at least one untested state; calculating, for the at least some deterministic state, a number of edges between the at least one deterministic state and the untested state as the cost.

Sun however discloses the missing limitation (Fig 10(c) and description; col: 13 line: 66 to col: 14 line: 6). Furthermore, Kadkade discloses the said limitation in **(col: 14 line: 40 to col: 15 line: 8)**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art <program modeling and simulation / behavior testing> at the time of Applicant's invention to combine the references and their features.

MPEP 2144.III states (based on the KSR vs. Teleflex Supreme Court Ruling, in part:

Exemplary rationales that may support a conclusion of [...] (D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results"

Accordingly, the following rationale is provided: one of ordinary skill could have applied the known improvement of the feature missing in the primary reference and the results would have been predictable. The analogous systems are both drawn to substantially identical subject matter of testing program behavior and evaluation of untested functions (in case of Sun that correlates to sections of code resulting in faults) with claimed nondeterministic features. As such, the combination would have been obvious for the reasons set-forth above. Motivation and common knowledge is further provided by Kadkade in **(col: 14 line: 40 to col: 15 line: 8)**.

Lee discloses: 3. The method of claim 1 wherein the continuous cycle of edges is created from the graph input using a Chinese Postman tour algorithm **(col: 2 line: 56 to col: 3 line: 9)**.

Lee discloses: 4. The method of claim 1 wherein the graph states are received as a set of deterministic vertices and a set of non-deterministic vertices **(col: 2 line: 28-36)**.

Kadkade discloses: 21: The method of claim 1 wherein calculating probability comprises calculating the probability that a nondeterministic state on a path from the deterministic state to the untested state will choose an edge that leads to the untested state **(col: 14 line: 40 to col: 15 line: 8; col: 15 line: 23-44)**.

Art Unit: 2128

Kadkade discloses: 23: The method of claim 1 further comprising walking backwards from the untested state to a second deterministic state (**col: 26 line: 51-58**).

12. Claims 7-15, 18, 20, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (**US 5,659,555**), further in view of Sun (**US 5630051**) in further view of Kadkade (**US 7290193**) and further in view of Kranzlmüller's "NOPE: A nondeterministic Program Evaluator" ("Kranzlmüller").

As per claim 7, note the rejection of claim 1 above. The Instant Claim recites substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claim and is therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings, but for memory and a central processing unit executing (**inherent**), a compiler operationally able to compile an executable specification into an abstract state machine (**Fig 3 Item 305 and Fig. description**), a graphing program operationally able to create a continuous cycle touching all edges of the abstract state machine, (**col: 5 line: 12-17; col: 6 line: 8-25; col: 5 line: 8-15; col: 6 line: 26-35; col: 4 line: 11-23; col: 8 line: 37-51**).

The limitation of operationally able to split the continuous cycle into discrete sequences that end at non-deterministic states is not expressly taught by the Lee in view of Sun rejection. Kranzlmüller however discloses the said missing feature. Kranzlmüller however discloses the missing limitation of splitting (page 490 section 1 "A traditional approach to error detection is cyclic debugging. [...] f is split up into subfunctions f₁, f₂,... f_n and repeated executions of f are used to determine the correct states between these subfunctions by analyzing intermediate results."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art <program modeling and simulation / behavior testing> at the time of Applicant's invention to combine the references and their features.

MPEP 2144.III states (based on the KSR vs. Teleflex Supreme Court Ruling, in part:

Exemplary rationales that may support a conclusion of [...] (D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results"

Accordingly, the following rationale is provided: one of ordinary skill could have applied the known improvement of splitting the function effectively using a finer resolution by splitting the function

Art Unit: 2128

into pieces in the same way to Lee's disclosure and the results would have been predictable. The analogous systems are both drawn to substantially identical subject matter of testing program behavior and evaluation of untested functions (in case of Kranzlmuller that correlates to sections of code resulting in errors) with claimed nondeterministic features. As such, the combination would have been obvious for the reasons set-forth above.

Lee discloses: 8. The system of claim 7 wherein a continuous cycle is determined according to a Chinese Postman algorithm (**col: 2 line: 56 to col: 3 line: 9**).

Lee discloses: 9. The system of claim 7 wherein discrete sequences comprise beginning states reachable from edges exiting non-deterministic states (**Fig 5 and its description; col: 12 line: 4-14**).

Lee discloses: 10. The system of claim 7 wherein an untouched discrete sequence is a state selectable from a program code executing at a remote computer (**Fig 2 item 7 (and Figure's descriptions)**

Application which is coupled to Presentation to Session to Transport to Network from Host A to Host B and is therefore remote).

Lee discloses: 11. The system of claim 7 wherein the abstract state machine comprises a graph of states and edges (**col: 6 line: 8-25**).

Lee discloses: 12. The system of claim 11 wherein the strategy calculation program receives the graph and an edge probability function as input (**Fig 5 and its descriptions**).

Lee discloses: 13. The system of claim 7 wherein untouched discrete sequences represent less than 10% of the discrete sequences and all untouched discrete sequences are touched when the program is executed according to the created strategies (**col: 8 line: 52 to col: 9 line: 7; a program without untouched discrete sequences anticipates this limitation**).

Lee discloses: 14. The system of claim 7 wherein not all untouched discrete sequences are verified when the program is executed according to the created strategies (**col: 4 line: 16**).

As per claim 15, note the rejection of claims 1 and 7 above. The Instant Claim recites substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings, wherein the "identified behavior" correlates to the "untested program behavior" because the untested program

Art Unit: 2128

behavior has to inherently be identified as being untested. Arguments to the contrary (arguments stating that untested behavior is not inherently identified) may result in claims 1, 15, and their respective dependent claims being rejected for 35 U.S.C. § 112 P1 enablement deficiencies.

Lee discloses: 18. The computer-readable medium of claim 15 wherein the non-deterministic behavior comprises communications with a remote computer (**col: 5 line: 18-25: "An FSM sends a message to other FSMs by means of an "output operation" designated by the "!" symbol. Where, for example, there are two FSMs, machine #1 and machine #2, an output operation in machine #1 is denoted by machine2!msg"**).

Lee discloses: 20. The computer-readable medium of claim 15 wherein the instructions for verifying program behavior cause the program to execute code that verifies that the program is in an expected model state (**col: 2 line: 28-36; col: 8 line: 37-51**).

As per claims 24 and 26, note the rejection of claims 21 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

As per claims 25, note the rejection of claims 23 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

Support for Amendments and Newly Added Claims

Applicants are respectfully requested, in the event of an amendment to claims or submission of new claims, that such claims and their limitations be directly mapped to the specification, which provides support for the subject matter. This will assist in expediting compact prosecution. MPEP 714.02 recites: "Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06. An amendment which does not comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121(b), (c), (d), and (h) may be held not fully responsive. See MPEP § 714." **Amendments not pointing to specific support in the disclosure may be deemed as not complying with provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.131(b), (c), (d), and (h) and therefore held not fully responsive.** Generic statements such as "Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced" may be deemed insufficient.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2128

13. All claims are rejected.
14. The Instant Application is not currently in condition for allowance.
15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Silver whose telephone number is (571) 272-8634. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 10am to 6:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on 571-272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kamini S Shah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2128

Art Unit: 2128

/ DS /

David Silver, Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2128